arXiv:1402.1199v3 [math.CO] 9 Mar 2014

A COMBINATORIAL PROOF OF STRICT UNIMODALITY FOR q-BINOMIAL COEFFICIENTS

VIVEK DHAND

ABSTRACT. I. Pak and G. Panova recently proved that the q-binomial coefficient $\binom{m+n}{m}_q$ is a strictly unimodal polynomial in q for $m, n \geq 8$, via the representation theory of the symmetric group. We give a direct combinatorial proof of their result by characterizing when a product of chains is strictly unimodal and then applying O'Hara's structure theorem for the partition lattice $L(m, n)$. In fact, we prove a stronger result: if $m, n \geq 8d$, and $2d \leq r \leq mn/2$, then the r-th rank of $L(m, n)$ has at least d more elements that the next lower rank.

1. INTRODUCTION

Recall that the lattice $L(m, n)$ consists of integer partitions whose Young diagrams fit inside an $(m \times n)$-rectangle, ordered by inclusion:

$$L(m, n) = \{(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m) \mid n \geq \lambda_1 \geq \ldots \lambda_m \geq 0\}.$$

The rank generating function for $L(m, n)$ is the q-binomial coefficient:

$$\binom{m+n}{m}_q = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1-q^{m+i}}{1-q^i} = \sum_{r=0}^{mn} p_r(m, n) q^r.$$

It is easy see that complementary ranks have the same size: $p_r(m, n) = p_{mn-r}(m, n)$. Sylvester was the first to prove the *unimodality* property [7]:

$$p_0(m, n) \leq \cdots \leq p_{\lfloor mn/2 \rfloor}(m, n).$$

Several other proofs have been discovered over the years using many different techniques, e.g. [5, 6, 9]. In particular, O'Hara gave a purely combinatorial proof by decomposing the underlying ranked set of $L(m, n)$ into a centered disjoint union of products of chains [3]. We use a slightly modified version of O'Hara's theorem to prove the following:

1.1. **Theorem.** If $m, n \geq 8d$ and $2d \leq r \leq mn/2$, then:

$$p_r(m, n) - p_{r-1}(m, n) \geq d.$$

If $d = 1$, we recover the strict unimodality theorem of Pak-Panova [4]:

1.2. **Theorem.** If $m, n \geq 8$ and $2 \leq r \leq mn/2$, then:

$$p_r(m,n) - p_{r-1}(m,n) > 0.$$

In what follows we will ignore the partial order on $L(m,n)$ and simply work with the underlying ranked set. The following is a restatement of O'Hara's structure theorem [2, 3]:

1.3. **Theorem.** There is a decomposition of $L(m,n)$ into centered rank-symmetric unimodal subsets $Q_m(d_0,\ldots,d_k)$, where:

$$k = \lfloor m/2 \rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad n = d_0 + 2d_1 + \cdots + (k+1)d_k,$$

and there exist isomorphisms of ranked sets:

$$Q_m(d_0,\ldots,d_k) \simeq L(r, \ell_m(d_0,\ldots,d_k)) \times Q_{m-2r}(d_r,\ldots,d_k)$$

where:

$$r = 1 + \min\{j \mid d_j > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_m(d_0,\ldots,d_k) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} (m-2j)d_j.$$

1.4. **Remark.** There are several equivalent ways to define the sets $Q_m(d_0,\ldots,d_k)$. For example, they are the level sets of certain tropical polynomials [1]:

$$f_{m,r}(\lambda) = \min_{0 \leq t_0 \leq \cdots \leq t_{m-2r} \leq r} \sum_{j=0}^{m-2r} a_{2t_j+j},$$

where $\lambda_0 = n, \lambda_{m+1} = 0$, and $a_i = \lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}$. We have the formula:

$$Q_m(d_0,\ldots,d_k) = \{\lambda \in L(m,n) \mid f_{m,r}(\lambda) = \sum_{j=r}^{k} (j+1-r)d_j \text{ for } 1 \leq r \leq k\}.$$

In particular, it follows that $Q_m(d_0,\ldots,d_k)$ has a unique minimal element, and its rank is equal to:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} j(j+1)d_j.$$

1.5. **Remark.** Our proof involves choosing subsets $Q_m(d_0,\ldots,d_k) \subset L(m,n)$ whose strictly unimodal ranges provide a covering of the desired interval. F. Zanello has given a similar combinatorial proof [8].

2. Strict unimodality for chain products

Let P be a ranked poset P of length n. Let p_i denote the size of the i-th rank of P. We say that P is *rank-symmetric* if $p_i = p_{n-i}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. We say that a rank-symmetric poset P is *strictly unimodal* if:

$$p_0 < \cdots < p_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}.$$

In this section, we determine when a product of chains is strictly unimodal. We will apply this result in the next section to prove the theorem.

Given a non-negative integer a, let $[a] = \{0 < \cdots < a\}$ denote a chain of length a.

2.1. **Lemma.** Let $P = [a_1] \times \cdots \times [a_n]$, where $a_1 \geq \cdots \geq a_n \geq 0$. Let C be a shortest chain in a symmetric chain decomposition of P.

(1) P is strictly unimodal from rank 0 up to the lowest rank of C.

(2) The length of C is equal to:

$$\ell(C) = \max(a_1 - (a_2 + \cdots + a_n), \epsilon)$$

where $\epsilon = 0$ (resp. $\epsilon = 1$) if $a_1 + \cdots + a_n$ is even (resp. odd).

(3) P is strictly unimodal if and only if:

$$a_1 \leq a_2 + \cdots + a_n + 1.$$

Proof. We will simultaneously prove these statements by induction on n. Consider the base case $n = 2$. There is a well-known symmetric chain decomposition:

$$[a_1] \times [a_2] \simeq \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{a_2} [a_1 + a_2 - 2i]$$

where the lowest rank of the i-th chain is i. Since there is a new symmetric chain starting at each rank from 0 to a_2, we see that $[a_1] \times [a_2]$ is strictly unimodal from rank 0 up to a_2, which is equal to the lowest rank of the shortest chain. The length of the shortest chain is:

$$a_1 + a_2 - 2a_2 = a_1 - a_2,$$

so $[a_1] \times [a_2]$ is strictly unimodal if and only if $a_1 - a_2 \leq 1$.

For $n \geq 3$, let $R = [a_2] \times \cdots \times [a_n]$ so:

$$P = [a_1] \times R.$$

Let D be a shortest chain in a symmetric chain decomposition of R, and let r denote the lowest rank of D. By induction, R is strictly unimodal from rank 0 up r and the length of D is equal to:

$$\ell(D) = \max(a_2 - (a_3 + \cdots + a_n), \epsilon')$$

where $\epsilon' = 0$ (resp. $\epsilon' = 1$) if $a_2 + \cdots + a_n$ is even (resp. odd). In any case, we have:

$$a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \ell(D).$$

Now, the length of the *longest* chain in R is $a_2 + \cdots + a_n$, and the lengths of all the symmetric chains in R have the same parity.

If $a_1 \leq a_2 + \cdots + a_n$, then the smallest difference between a_1 and the lengths of all the symmetric chains in R is equal to 0 or 1, depending on the parity of $a_1 + \cdots + a_n$. In other words, the length of a shortest chain C in any SCD of P will be 0 or 1. On the other hand, if $a_1 > a_2 + \cdots + a_n$, then:

$$\ell(C) = a_1 - (a_2 + \cdots + a_n)$$

by our formula from the base case. Therefore, we obtain:

$$\ell(C) = \max(a_1 - (a_2 + \cdots + a_n), \epsilon).$$

Note that P is strictly unimodal from rank 0 up to the lowest rank of C because P is a disjoint union over products of the form $[a_1] \times D'$, where D' runs over the symmetric chains in a fixed SCD of R. Finally, P is strictly unimodal if and only if $\ell(C) \leq 1$, and the result follows. □

3. Proof of the theorem

3.1. **Theorem.** If $m, n \geq 8d$ and $2d \leq r \leq mn/2$, then:

$$p_r(m,n) - p_{r-1}(m,n) \geq d.$$

Proof. **Step 1:** Consider $Q_m(d_0, d_1, 0, \ldots, 0) \subset L(m,n)$ where $d_0, d_1 > 0$. This ranked set is isomorphic to a product of two chains:

$$[md_0 + (m-2)d_1] \times [(m-2)d_1].$$

The lowest rank element of this set has rank $2d_1$. Note that $n = d_0 + 2d_1$ so $n > 2d_1$. We know that a product of two chains of the form $[a+b] \times [b]$ is strictly unimodal from rank 0 to rank b, so $Q_m(d_0, d_1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is strictly unimodal from rank $2d_1$ up to rank:

$$2d_1 + (m-2)d_1 = md_1.$$

Therefore, we see that:

$$p_r(m,n) - p_{r-1}(m,n) \geq d$$

for all $2d \leq r \leq mn/2 - dm$ and $n > 2d$.

Step 2: Consider $Q_m(d_0, d_1, d_2, 0, \ldots, 0) \subset L(m,n)$ where $d_0, d_1, d_2 > 0$. This ranked set is isomorphic to a product of three chains:

$$[md_0 + (m-2)d_1 + (m-4)d_2] \times [(m-2)d_1 + (m-4)d_2] \times [(m-4)d_2].$$

The lowest rank element of this set has rank $2d_1 + 6d_2$. We know that the product of three chains of the form $[a+b+c] \times [b+c] \times [c]$ is strictly unimodal if and only if $a \leq c+1$, so $Q_m(d_0, d_1, d_2, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is strictly unimodal if and only if:

$$md_0 \leq (m-4)d_2 + 1.$$

Let $N_3(m,n)$ denote the number of strictly unimodal subsets in $L(m,n)$ of the above type:

$$N_3(m,n) = \{(d_0,d_1,d_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^3_{>0} \mid d_0 + 2d_1 + 3d_2 = n,\ md_0 \leq (m-4)d_2 + 1\}.$$

Now let us calculate the largest possible value of d_2, depending on $n \pmod 3$:

$$n = 0 \pmod 3 \implies (d_0,d_1,d_2) = (1,1,(n-3)/3).$$
$$n = 1 \pmod 3 \implies (d_0,d_1,d_2) = (2,1,(n-4)/3).$$
$$n = 2 \pmod 3 \implies (d_0,d_1,d_2) = (1,2,(n-5)/3).$$

Therefore, the largest possible value of $2d_1 + 6d_2$ is equal to $2n-4$ if $n = 0 \pmod 3$ and $2n-6$ otherwise.

It follows that:

$$p_r(m,n) - p_{r-1}(m,n) \geq N_3(m,n)$$

for all $2n-4 \leq r \leq mn/2$.

Step 3: We see that we are reduced to satisfying the following inequalities:

$$mn/2 - dm \geq 2n-4 \quad \text{and} \quad N_3(m,n) \geq d.$$

The first inequality is equivalent to:

$$m \geq \frac{4n-8}{n-2d}.$$

If $d \geq 1$ and $m,n \geq 8d$, then the above inequality does hold:

$$m(n-2d) \geq 8d(n-2d) = d(8n-16d) \geq 8n-16d \geq 4n+32d-16d = 4n+16d \geq 4n-8.$$

Let us now estimate a lower bound for $N_3(m,n)$. For a fixed value of d_0, we find that:

$$3d_2 = n - d_0 - 2d_1 \leq n - 2 - d_0.$$

Given a possible solution (d_1,d_2), note that the next solution is (d_1+3, d_2-2), so all the possible values of d_2 must have the same parity mod 2. Therefore:

$$\frac{md_0 - 1}{m-4} \leq d_2 \leq \frac{n-2-d_0}{3}$$

where all the values of d_2 must have the same parity mod 2. So the number of solutions is at least:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{n-2-d_0}{3} - \frac{md_0-1}{m-4}\right).$$

Summing over the allowed values of d_0, we obtain:

$$N_3(m,n) \geq \frac{1}{2}\sum_{d_0}\left(\frac{n-2-d_0}{3} - \frac{md_0-1}{m-4}\right).$$

Note that, if $m \geq 8$, then:

$$md_0 - 1 < 2d_0(m-4) = 2md_0 - 8d_0$$

because:

$$md_0 \geq 8d_0 > 8d_0 - 1.$$

Therefore:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{n-2-d_0}{3}-\frac{md_0-1}{m-4}\right)>\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{n-2-d_0}{3}-2d_0\right)=\frac{n-2-7d_0}{6}.$$

If $d\geq 3$, then $m,n\geq 24$ and by considering the first three terms we obtain:

$$N_3(m,n)\geq\frac{n-9}{6}+\frac{n-16}{6}+\frac{n-23}{6}=\frac{n-16}{2}\geq 4d-8\geq d$$

for all $d\geq 3$. It remains to prove the theorem for $1\leq d\leq 2$.

Step 4: Consider $Q_m(d_0,d_1,d_2,d_3,0,\ldots,0)\subset L(m,n)$ where $d_0,d_1,d_2,d_3>0$. This ranked set is isomorphic to a product of four chains:

$$[\ell_0]\times[\ell_1]\times[\ell_2]\times[\ell_3],$$

where $\ell_3=(m-6)d_3$, $\ell_2=\ell_3+(m-4)d_2$, $\ell_1=\ell_2+(m-2)d_1$, and $\ell_0=\ell_1+md_0$. It is strictly unimodal if and only if:

$$\ell_0-\ell_1\leq\ell_2+\ell_3+1,$$

which translates to the condition that:

$$md_0\leq(m-4)d_2+2(m-6)d_3.$$

If $d_2,d_3\geq d_0$ we get:

$$(m-4)d_2+2(m-6)d_3\geq d_0(3m-16)\geq md_0$$

for all $m\geq 8$. In other words, $Q_m(1,d_1,d_2,d_3,0,\ldots,0)\subset L(m,n)$ is strictly unimodal if there exist $x,y,z\geq 0$ such that $2x+3y+4z=n-10$. The standard generating function argument shows that the existence of at least one solution for all $n\geq 12$ and at least two solutions for all $n\geq 16$. So the $d=2$ case is finished, and for $d=1$ we can check the remaining cases $8\leq m,n\leq 11$ by inspection.

Finally, we check that the lowest rank of $Q_m(1,d_1,d_2,d_3,0,\ldots,0)$ is at most $mn/2-dm$ for $d=1,2$ and $m,n\geq 8d$. The largest possible value of d_3, depending on n (mod 4), is given by:

$$n=0\ (\text{mod }4)\implies(d_0,d_1,d_2,d_3)=(1,2,1,(n-8)/4).$$

$$n=1\ (\text{mod }4)\implies(d_0,d_1,d_2,d_3)=(1,1,2,(n-9)/4).$$

$$n=2\ (\text{mod }4)\implies(d_0,d_1,d_2,d_3)=(1,1,1,(n-6)/4).$$

$$n=3\ (\text{mod }4)\implies(d_0,d_1,d_2,d_3)=(1,2,2,(n-11)/4).$$

Therefore, the largest possible value for the lowest rank $2d_1+6d_2+12d_3$ is $3n-10$. Now:

$$mn/2-dm\geq 4n-8d\geq 3n+n-8d\geq 3n\geq 3n-10,$$

so $mn/2-dm\geq 3n-10$ for $m,n\geq 8d$ as desired. □

3.2. **Remark.** The lower bounds on m,n, and r given above are certainly not the best possible. One could improve the bounds on m and n by calculating the number of strictly unimodal products of five or more chains. One could also improve the bound on r by finding the overlaps among the strictly unimodal ranges for all products of three or more chains. The lower bound on r given in [8] is quadratic in d, while our lower bound is linear in d. The best possible lower bound for r is logarithmic in d, since it involves the inverse of the number of partitions of r.

References

[1] V. Dhand, Tropical decomposition of Young's partition lattice. *J. Alg. Comb.* (2013) DOI 10.1007/s10801-013-0467-4.

[2] V. Dhand, Rank unimodality of Young's lattice via explicit chain decomposition. `http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.2536`.

[3] K. O'Hara, Unimodality of Gaussian coefficients: a constructive proof, J. Comb. Theory Ser. A. 53, 29-52 (1990).

[4] I. Pak and G. Panova, Strict unimodality of q-binomial coefficients, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, Ser. I (2013)

[5] R. A. Proctor, Solution of two difficult combinatorial problems with linear algebra. *Amer. Math. Monthly* 89, (1982) 721–734 .

[6] R. P. Stanley, Weyl Groups, the hard Lefschetz theorem, and the Sperner property. *SIAM J. Alg. and Disc. Methods* 1, (1980) 168–184 .

[7] J. J. Sylvester, Proof of the hitherto undemonstrated fundamental theorem of invariants. In *The collected mathematical papers of James Joseph Sylvester*, Vol. 3 Cambridge University Press, Chelsea, New York (1973), 117–126 .

[8] F. Zanello, Zeilberger's KOH theorem and the strict unimodality of q-binomial coefficients, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.4480`.

[9] D. Zeilberger, Kathy O'Hara's constructive proof of the unimodality of the Gaussian polynomials. *Amer. Math. Monthly* 96 (1989), 590–602.